

I have long sought to bring recognition to the crimes perpetuated against the Armenian people as genocide. In fact, I have introduced S. Res. 320, which affirms the Armenian genocide. The resolution calls on the President to state that the slaughter of Armenians by the Ottoman Empire was genocide and to recall the proud history of U.S. intervention in opposition to the Armenian genocide. It is important that the U.S. once and for all reaffirms the incontestable facts of history and allows our representatives to speak out about the crimes perpetuated against the Armenian people from 1915 to 1923. It is my sincere hope that this legislation comes before the full Senate soon.

As we fight to ensure freedom around the globe, we must ensure that our future reflects the lessons of the past. In this case the facts are incontestable. Armenians were subjected to deportation, expropriation, abduction, torture, massacre, and starvation. Yes, the Armenian people were victims of genocide. Genocide at any time, at any place, is wrong and needs to be confronted and remembered.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as the Republican leadership gavels this session to a close, I am disappointed by the inaction and missed opportunities on America's most crucial priorities.

First, although we did finally pass a long overdue port security bill, we still have a long way to go to protect our infrastructure. We knew before 9/11 that our ports are soft targets, and since that terrible day, many experts have continued to warn us that they are vulnerable to attack.

Since the 9/11 attacks, we have spent only \$984 million on port security grants, despite Coast Guard estimates that \$5.4 billion is needed over 10 years. That total includes the grants that were released this week.

To make matters worse, port security funds aren't reaching the ports that need them the most. In California, port security grants awarded by the Bush administration have fallen from \$33.3 million in fiscal year 2005 to \$13.3 million in fiscal year 2006, a staggering 60 percent reduction. Despite the fact that California's ports carry over 47 percent of all goods imported into the United States, we are receiving only eight percent of the total port security grants funding.

In addition, the final port security bill lacks the Senate-passed transit and rail security provisions. The last three major attacks have been on transit systems in Madrid, London, and in July, Mumbai. According to APTA, there are \$6 billion in transit security needs across the country. But last year, Congress appropriated only \$150 million for transit and rail security. That is barely a drop in the bucket. Americans take 33 million trips on transit each day. We must do more to protect them.

The Senate bill also does not consider aviation security. Yes, aviation security has improved greatly in the last five years. But five years after 9/11, we are still not screening cargo loaded on board passenger planes. I am pleased that DHS will launch a pilot program at San Francisco Airport, SFO, this October to check all commercial cargo for explosives on passenger flights, but we should be doing this at every airport in America to ensure the safety of passengers and the solvency of the airline industry.

But until that time, at the very least, we need to use at least one blast resistant cargo container on passenger planes that carry cargo. This was one of the major recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. When I tried to offer an amendment to do just that, the Republican managers of the bill blocked my amendment.

Cost is not the problem here. The price to place one blast-resistant container on planes is about \$75 million or a little more than the price of 5 hours in Iraq. The American people deserve to know that we are doing everything we can to keep them safe. We cannot allow terrorists to exploit holes in our aviation security system.

Second, although we passed border fence legislation, we failed to act on the AgJOBS bill, which would provide a much-needed solution to the farm labor shortage crisis that is threatening our nation's farm economy. In California and across America, fruit and vegetables are dying on the vine and rotting in the fields because there are no workers to harvest the crops.

Earlier today, my friend from Georgia, Senator CHAMBLISS, came to the floor to speak against the AgJOBS bill. He said that as he has traveled the country this year holding farm bill hearings, every farmer he met told him to oppose AgJOBS.

Yet, if the Senator from Georgia had come to California, our Nation's largest agricultural State, he would have heard from farmers who desperately need and want the AgJobs bill passed now. And they are not alone. Farmers in States experiencing labor shortages in Idaho, Washington, New York and Florida, among others, want this bill, as do a broad coalition of pro-agriculture groups.

The H-2A program is badly in need of reform, and the AgJOBS bill, which the Senate has already passed with more than 60 votes, enacts those meaningful reforms. These AgJobs will save users money, simplify the program, streamline the litigation process, and bring stability to our nation's agricultural work force.

And third, we also failed to stand up for fair and smooth elections. On Tuesday, Senators DODD, FEINGOLD and I introduced the Confidence in Voting Act of 2006, S. 3943, a simple bill that would reimburse electoral jurisdictions for the cost of contingency paper ballots for the General Election. Under the bill, the jurisdictions would be reim-

bursed for their documented costs up to \$0.75 per contingency paper ballot printed.

This bill is timely in light of the recent problems with voting machines in Maryland, Illinois, Ohio and other states. It is clear that many jurisdictions that use electronic voting machines and other voting systems will need to have a backup plan for the upcoming November 7, 2006, general election.

The Confidence in Voting Act of 2006 would work within the existing structure of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to provide reimbursement funding for jurisdictions that provide a contingency paper ballot in addition to their existing voting system. The estimated maximum cost of this measure is approximately \$15 million a small price to pay to ensure that every American's vote is counted.

The American people deserve better. We face great challenges that will determine our safety and prosperity for years to come. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting long overdue legislation for the security of our infrastructure, to aid our farmers, and to ensure our right to fair and accountable elections.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVIVOR BENEFITS PLAN

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, although we have accomplished much to be proud of in this Defense authorization bill, I am profoundly disappointed that once again we have failed to eliminate the SBP-DIC offset.

For the last 5 years I have been talking about the unfair and painful offset of the Defense Department's survivors benefits plan against Veterans Affairs' dependency and indemnity compensation, or DIC. This offset mistreats the survivors of our servicemembers who die on active duty now and our 100 percent disabled military retirees who purchased this benefit at the end of their careers. It is wrong, we know it, and the Senate has tried to fix it—but we have fallen short again.

I have reminded the Senate of the Good Book's words, that in God's eyes the true measure of our faith is how we look after orphans and widows in their distress. And they are in distress. We are in a violent struggle around the world with brutal and vicious enemies. Sadly, Americans are lost every day.

We must never forget that the families left behind by our courageous men and women in uniform bear the greatest pain. Their survivors' lives are forever altered; their futures left unclear. They suffer the enduring cost of the ultimate sacrifice, and the Nation that asked for that sacrifice must honor it. We are the ones who must recognize that the Nation has an obligation to those who give their lives for our country.

This conference report does not include the Senate's provision to eliminate this offset. In the Senate, we included the funds necessary to support

this change in our version of the budget resolution. Accordingly, the Armed Services Committee included a provision to eliminate the offset, thanks to our chairman, Senator JOHN WARNER. However, the conference could not find a way to bring this to closure. Our eligible survivors are again let down.

Mr. President, I have felt honored over the years to champion this important change in our survivor benefits system. And, although disappointed, I am no less honored or resolved to continue this fight. I thank my many Senate colleagues who have felt as strongly as I about taking care of our military widows and orphans. I look forward to working with them again when we bring this to the Senate again in our next session. Our military men and women, and their survivors would never give up; neither will we.

GLOBAL WARMING REDUCTION ACT OF 2006

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today as the lead cosponsor for the Kerry-Snowe Global Warming Reduction Act of 2006. Six years into the 21st century, global warming should be on a trajectory toward solutions . . . international and domestic policies confronting climate change should already be in place. We believe that our bill will ultimately lead to decisive action to minimize the many dangers posed by global warming by calling for an 85 percent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions no later than 2050. Thankfully, Senator KERRY and I are not working in a policy vacuum as the United States is a party to the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has the objective of stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent "dangerous anthropogenic interference" with the climate system.

The risks associated with a temperature increase above two degrees centigrade are grave, including the disintegration of the Greenland ice sheet, which, if it were to melt completely, would raise global average sea level by approximately 23 feet, devastating many of the world's coastal areas and population centers. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change projects that temperatures will rise between 1.4 to 5.8 degrees centigrade, or 2.5 to 10.4 degrees fahrenheit, by the end of the century, under a range of expected emissions trends.

The Kerry-Snowe bill will map out the way to stabilization through a cap and trade system for major sectors of our society and establish the climate reinvestment fund consisting of amounts collected from carbon auctions of allowances and civil penalties. The fund will be used for investment in clean energy research and technology. The bill also provides for a research and development program on global climate change and abrupt climate change research. We also call for a re-

newable portfolio standard requiring 20 percent of electricity from renewable electricity by 2020, and an updated Renewable Fuel Standard and E85 infrastructure requirements of 10 percent by 2020.

The act also contains vehicle greenhouse gas emission standards for cars and light-duty vehicles as well as medium and heavy-duty vehicles. Importantly, our bill includes a resolution expressing the urgent need for the administration to reengage in international climate negotiations.

I do not come lightly nor lately to the climate change issue. That is why, this past year, when asked by three major independent think tanks—the Center for American Progress in the United States, the Institute for Public Policy Research in the U.K. and the Australia Institute—I accepted the co-chairmanship of the high level International Climate Change Taskforce—the ICCT—to chart a way forward on climate change on a parallel track with the Kyoto Protocol process. This led me to meetings both in Washington and London with my Cochair, the Rt. Honorable Stephen Byers of the U.K. for the international, cross-party, cross-sector collaboration of leaders from public service, science, business, and civil society from both developed and developing countries.

We set out a pathway to solve climate change issues in tandem collaboratively finding common ground through recommendations that are both ambitious and realistic to engage all countries, and, critically, including those not bound by the Kyoto Protocol and major developing countries. Our ICCT report, "Meeting the Climate Challenge," recommends ways to involve the world's largest economies in the effort, including the U.S. and major developing nations, focusing on creating new agreements to achieve the deployment of clean energy technologies and a new global policy framework that is both inclusive and fair. Like the Kerry-Snowe legislation, the ICCT Report calls for the establishment of a long-term objective of preventing global average temperature from rising more than 2 degrees centigrade.

The taskforce arrived at the 2 degrees centigrade temperature increase goal on the basis of an extensive review of the relevant scientific literature that shows that, as the ICCT Report states:

Beyond the 2 degrees centigrade level, the risks to human societies and ecosystems grow significantly. It is likely, for example, that average temperature increases larger than this will entail substantial agricultural losses, will greatly increase the numbers of people at risk of water shortages, and widespread adverse health impacts.

Our ICCT Report goes on to say that:

Climate science is not yet able to specify the trajectory of atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases that corresponds precisely to any particular global temperature rise. Based on current knowledge, however, it appears that achieving a high probability

of limiting global average temperature rise to 2 degrees centigrade will require that the increase in greenhouse-gas concentrations as well as all the other warming and cooling influences on global climate in the year 2100, as compared with 1750, should add up to a net warming no greater than what would be associated with a CO₂ concentration of about 400 parts per million (ppm).

The Kerry-Snowe bill reverses the growth of greenhouse gas emissions starting in 2010 and then progresses to more rapid reductions over time, out to 2050, meant to protect against a temperature rise above 2 degrees centigrade, which is predicted to mean that global atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide will not exceed 450 parts per million. The bill gets the US on the right track, but at the same time avoiding any negative impact on our economy.

Achieving success for our policy imperatives means disabusing skeptics and opponents alike of cherished mythologies that environmental protection and economic growth are mutually exclusive. The irony is both are actually increasingly interdependent and will only become more so as the 21st century progresses. Robust companies dedicated to reducing emissions are proof-positive "going-green" represents a burgeoning sector of our economy, not the drain and hindrance we've been led to believe for so many years.

And to their credit the most progressive U.S. companies have reduced emissions even further than required in climate bills offered in the Congress to date. In an act of economic acumen, they are hedging their bets by adopting internal targets—and, these companies are saving money by reducing their energy consumption and positioning themselves to compete in the growing global market for climate-friendly technologies. Any cost-conscious CFO or forward-thinking CEO for that matter should admit that to prevent pollution now will most certainly cost less than cleaning it up later.

And the economics of prevention and stewardship resonate more when you consider property that erodes because of rising sea levels, farm land that fails to yield crops and becomes barren and arid, and revenue opportunities squandered because of dwindling fishing stocks caused by hotter temperatures. These represent real costs to the bottom line not to mention irreparable damage to our health and quality of life.

Mr. President, temperatures are rising to levels the earth has not experienced for more than a thousand years. The snows of Kilimanjaro are melting so fast that they may completely vanish in 15 years. Alaska's average temperature has increased nearly five and a half degrees over the past 30 years and explains melting permafrost, sagging roads, and dying forests. A Peruvian glacier in the Andes Mountain, as reported by The Washington Post, is receding at a rate of 360 yards per year, up from a recession rate of just four